

Gary M. Hoffman (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Kenneth W. Brothers (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
**DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN**  
& OSHINSKY, LLP  
2101 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-1526  
Phone (202) 785-9700  
Fax (202) 887-0689

Edward A. Meilman (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN  
& OSHINSKY, LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
Phone (212) 835-1400  
Fax (212) 997-9880

Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715  
Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008  
ALTSHULER, BERZON, NUSSBAUM, RUBIN & DEMAIN  
177 Post Street, Suite 300  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Phone (415) 421-7151  
Fax (415) 362-8064

Attorneys for Plaintiff Ricoh Company, Ltd.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

SYNOPSYS, INC.,	)	CASE NO. C-03-2289-MJJ
Plaintiff,	)	CASE NO. C-03-4669-MJJ
vs.	)	
RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,	)	
Defendant.	)	
<hr/>		
RICOH COMPANY, LTD.,	)	RICOH'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS
Plaintiff,	)	MOTION FOR SANCTIONS
vs.	)	Date: Not Set
AEROFLEX INCORPORATED, et al.,	)	Time: Not Set
Defendants	)	Courtroom: 11
<hr/>		

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. RICOH'S MOTION SHOULD BE GRANTED ON THE STRENGTH OF THE UNDISPUTED FACTS .....	3
II. RESPONDENTS HAVE MISSTATED THE APPLICABLE LAW.....	9
A. The Controlling Standard of Proof for Sanctions Motions.....	9
B. This Court Has The Power and Right to Protect Ricoh's Confidential Information .....	10
C. Mr. Campbell's Ongoing Contacts With Dr. Thomas Were Improper.....	10
III. THE DISPUTED FACTS FURTHER SUPPORT RICOH'S MOTION.....	11
A. Respondents' Conduct Was Inconsistent With <i>Shadow Traffic</i> and <i>Wang</i> .....	11
B. Dr. Thomas Has Been Tainted By Respondents' Conduct.....	12
C. Respondents Have Wrongfully Refused to Produce a Privilege Log .....	13
D. Respondents Misled the Court .....	13
IV. CONCLUSION: SANCTIONS ARE APPROPRIATE.....	15

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

## FEDERAL CASES

<i>Atari Corp v. Sega of America</i> , 161 F.R.D. 417 (N.D. Cal. 1994) .....	11
<i>Biocore Medical Tech., Inc., v. Khasrowshahi</i> , 181 F.R.D. 660 (D. Kan. 1998) .....	5
<i>Campbell Ind. v. M/V Gemini</i> , 619 F.2d 24 (9th Cir. 1980).....	9, 10, 11
<i>Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.</i> , 501 U.S. 32 (1991).....	9
<i>Cordy v. Sherwin-Williams Co.</i> , 156 F.R.D. 575 (D.N.J. 1994).....	4, 10, 15
<i>Crouse v. National Warehouse Investment Co.</i> , 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9066 (S.D. Indiana 2003) .....	5
<i>Durflinger v. Artiles</i> , 727 F.2d 888 (10th Cir. 1984) .....	11
<i>Erickson v. Newmar Corp.</i> , 87 F.3d 298 (9th Cir. 1996) .....	10, 11
<i>F.J. Hanshaw Enterprises v. Emerald River Development, Inc.</i> , 244 F.3d 1128 (9th Cir. 2000) .....	9
<i>Primus v. Batarse</i> , 115 F.3d 644 (9th Cir. 1997) .....	9
<i>Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper</i> , 447 U.S. 752 (1980) .....	9
<i>Rubel v. Eli Lilly</i> , 160 F.R.D. 458 (S.D.N.Y. 1995) .....	13
<i>Shadow Traffic v. Superior Court</i> , 24 Cal. App. 4th 1067 (1994).....	passim
<i>In Re Silberkraus</i> , 253 B.R. 890 (Bankr. C.D. Cal. 2000) .....	10
<i>Space Systems/Loral v. Martin Marietta Corp.</i> , 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22305 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 1995).....	10
<i>Wang Labs., Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.</i> , 993 F.2d 858 (Fed. Cir. 1993) .....	2, 6, 11, 12

## FEDERAL STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1927 ..... 9, 10

## MISCELLANEOUS

2 Geoffrey C. Hazard & W. William Hodes, *The Law of Lawyering* § 3.4:402  
 (2d ed. Supp. 1994) ..... 10

## INTRODUCTION

Ricoh’s counsel has made multiple attempts to amicably resolve this unfortunate matter, including the latest meet and confer on December 10, 2003. Rather than consider any compromise, however, Synopsys and the ASIC defendants (collectively “respondents”) have responded with defiant adjectives, claiming that Ricoh’s motion is “dishonest” and “perverse.” (Opp. Br. at 13, 20, 24.)<sup>1</sup> Notwithstanding such vitriol, the reality is that counsel for Synopsys and the ASIC defendants knowingly persuaded one of Ricoh’s long-time consulting experts to switch sides, misrepresented the circumstances to Ricoh and the Court, then refused to comply with the Court’s orders to produce a privilege log. As a result, the witness has been irrevocably tainted; Ricoh has expended tens of thousands of dollars unnecessarily; and the Court must decide whether respondents’ attorneys should be disqualified.

Most of the important facts in Ricoh's moving papers are undisputed. As set forth in Section I, there is no dispute that Dr. Thomas was retained by Ricoh in May 2002, signed a written confidentiality agreement, helped Ricoh's counsel develop a litigation strategy by helping analyze the '432 patent and construe the claims of the patent, explore the prior art, evaluate a possible affirmative defense of invalidity, and assess whether respondents were infringing the '432 patent. There is also no dispute that, in early April 2003, respondents were placed on notice that Dr. Thomas was consulting with Ricoh's counsel, that respondents recognized that further communications with Dr. Thomas would be a conflict of interest, and that despite the recognized conflict, they continued to exchange emails with Dr. Thomas about the case. There is no dispute that respondents failed to serve either the Thomas subpoena or a notice of deposition, and that Ricoh's counsel was unaware of the communications between Dr. Thomas and attorney Campbell, which caused Dr. Thomas to terminate his 14 month consulting relationship with Ricoh and enter into a consulting relationship with Synopsys.

There is also no dispute that, prior to entering into the formal consulting relationship with Synopsys, no one asked Dr. Thomas if he received any confidential information from Ricoh, whether there was a conflict of interest, or whether Ricoh had any objection to respondents consulting with Dr. Thomas. Instead, the matter

<sup>1</sup> The ASIC defendants filed an opposing brief, two declarations and voluminous exhibits in Case No. C-03-4669-MJJ. Synopsys filed what appears to be an identical brief, declarations and exhibits in Case No. C-03-2289-MJJ. Cites to “Opp. Br.” are to the ASIC defendants brief.

1 was kept secret until Dr. Thomas signed the retainer agreement that provided that he would “not give expert  
 2 testimony adverse to Synopsys.” Respondents did not ask if Ricoh had any objections, but announced it as a  
 3 done deed. When Ricoh objected, respondents did not ask Ricoh to explain why there was a conflict of  
 4 interest, or whether Dr. Thomas had received Ricoh confidential information, but instead forced Ricoh to seek  
 5 the intervention of the Court or waive its objections.

6 There is no dispute that only after Synopsys retained Dr. Thomas and Ricoh objected, did respondents  
 7 initiate for the first time an investigation of the factual basis for the conflict of interest that they acknowledged  
 8 more than three months earlier. There is also no dispute that, even before Dr. Thomas had responded to this  
 9 inquiry, respondents told Ricoh: “Before we considered retaining Dr. Thomas as a consultant, we made an  
 10 investigation to determine that his would not create a conflict of interest for Dr. Thomas.” There is no dispute  
 11 that this representation was, and is, false.

12 There is no dispute about the words Mr. Kelley spoke to Judge Sleet at the July 30 hearing, although  
 13 respondents now try to parse those words in an attempt to fashion an argument. There is also no dispute that, at  
 14 the August 28 hearing, Judge Sleet recalled Mr. Kelley’s earlier representations, and agreed that there may have  
 15 been a “fraud on the Court.” Finally, there is no dispute that respondents have not provided a privilege log,  
 16 despite the July 31 Order and the instructions of the Court during the August 28 hearing.

17 There are three disputed issues of law, which are addressed in Section II. Respondents erroneously  
 18 argue for a higher burden of proof that has been required by the Ninth Circuit. Respondents are also incorrect  
 19 when they attempt to limit the type of confidential information protected by courts in side-switching cases to  
 20 attorney-client privilege and exclude information protected by the attorney work product doctrine. In *Shadow*  
*Traffic*, the potential for disclosure of attorney work product with an unretained expert led to disqualification.  
 22 Respondents also miscite a single case to justify their repeated ex parte contacts with Dr. Thomas while he was  
 23 still a Ricoh consultant.

24 There are only four disputed issues to be resolved: (1) whether respondents’ conduct was consistent  
 25 with *Shadow Traffic* and *Wang*; (2) whether respondents’ conduct has tainted Dr. Thomas’ testimony on fact  
 26 issues; (3) whether respondents have defied a Court Order to produce a privilege log; and (4) whether  
 27 respondents misled the Court during the July 30 and August 28 hearings. We address each of these issues in  
 28 Section III.

1       The undisputed facts alone strongly suggest that Ricoh's motion should be granted. Ricoh is confident  
 2 that when the Court resolves the remaining disputed issues, it will exercise its discretion to fashion a remedy  
 3 that is appropriate to protect the interests of justice.

4       **I. RICOH'S MOTION SHOULD BE GRANTED ON THE STRENGTH OF THE  
 5 UNDISPUTED FACTS**

6       There following facts and principles of law are undisputed by respondents:

7       **Uncontested Fact No. 1:** Ricoh retained Dr. Thomas as a consulting expert in May 2002. (Brothers  
 8 Decl. Ex. 1, Monsey Decl. ¶¶ 2-4.)

9       **Uncontested Fact No. 2:** Dr. Thomas signed a written consulting agreement where he specifically  
 10 promised to keep confidential all information provided to him. (Id. ¶ 3; Brothers Decl. Ex. 2.)

11       **Uncontested Fact No. 3:** Respondents completely ignore the Monsey declaration, which details the  
 12 disclosure of Ricoh's confidential information to Dr. Thomas as follows:

- 13       5. After I had received the signed confidentiality agreement from Dr. Thomas, I sent him the '432  
 14 patent and an additional reference exceeding 50 pages in length, and an instruction letter. I  
 asked Dr. Thomas to analyze the reference and compare it to the '432 patent.
- 15       6. On June 2, 2002, Dr. Thomas sent me a two page email reporting on the results of his analysis  
 and discussing the impact of the reference upon the '432 patent.
- 16       7. On June 5, 2002, I had a 90 minute telephone conversation with Dr. Thomas discussing his  
 17 analysis in greater detail. During that conversation, I discussed Ricoh's confidential  
 infringement positions and certain potential prior art. During this conversation, Dr. Thomas  
 18 expressed his opinions with respect to the validity of the '432 patent.
- 19       8. On June 6, 2002, I sent an additional document of 12 pages to Dr. Thomas and asked for his  
 analysis compared to the '432 Patent.
- 20       9. On June 7, 2002, Dr. Thomas sent a one-page email reporting on his analysis. I had a follow up  
 21 phone conversation with Dr. Thomas the same day regarding his analysis. After our  
 conversation, I sent Dr. Thomas two additional document of approximately 50 pages and asked  
 22 for his further analysis.
- 23       10. On June 10, 2002, I had a 20 minute phone conversation with Dr. Thomas regarding those  
 documents. I discussed my work product relating to affirmative defenses of invalidity and non-  
 infringement that the defendants might attempt to raise.
- 24       11. On June 17, 2002, I had an 80 minute conversation with Dr. Thomas, in which he reported on  
 25 the results of his analysis. During this conversation, I further disclosed confidential and  
 privileged information, and Dr. Thomas expressed several opinions with respect to the proper  
 claim construction, validity and infringement of the '432 patent. After that conversation, I sent  
 26 Dr. Thomas an additional document of more than 10 pages and requested his analysis.
- 27       12. On June 18, 2002, I sent Dr. Thomas an email specifically asking for his opinions on the  
 28 infringement issues that are presented in this litigation. On June 19, 2002, Dr. Thomas  
 responded with a one-page email in which he expressed several opinions and proposed

1 alternative theories.

- 2 13. On June 21, 2002, I had a one hour conversation with Dr. Thomas in which we further  
 3 discussed my attorney work product and his opinions regarding claim construction, validity and  
 4 infringement. Dr. Thomas also sent me a follow-up email on June 21, 2002, communicating  
 5 further opinions. After that conversation I sent him more than 100 pages of additional material  
 6 for his analysis.
- 7 14. On June 24, 2002, I had a 30 minute phone conversation with Dr. Thomas. On June 26, 2002, I  
 8 had a 55 minute conversation with Dr. Thomas. During both of these conversations, I further  
 9 disclosed my legal analysis regarding Ricoh's litigation strategy, and he expressed further  
 10 opinions regarding claim construction, validity and infringement.
- 11 15. Through these confidential discussions, Dr. Thomas became well-informed of the heart of  
 12 Ricoh's case strategy.

13 (Brothers Decl. Ex. 1.) Counsel's selection of the hundreds of pages of documents provided to Dr. Thomas  
 14 that Mr. Monsey detailed is core work product. *Cordy v. Sherwin Williams*, 156 F.R.D. 575, 581 (D.N.J. 1994)  
 15 (holding that an attorney's selection of documents is protectible work product).<sup>2</sup>

16 **Uncontested Fact No. 4:** Dr. Thomas testified that he recognized his receipt of Ricoh's confidential  
 17 information :

18 Q. Is there any doubt in your mind, Dr. Thomas, that as a result of your consulting relationship with  
 19 Ricoh, you received confidential information from Ricoh's counsel?

20 A. I feel that the fact that they were bringing these articles to my attention was confidential.

21 ***Q. And the fact and content of your conversations with Ricoh's counsel, were those also  
 22 confidential information?***

23 **A. Yes.**

24 (Brothers Decl. Ex. 4, Thomas Dep. Tr. at 76-77, emphasis added.)

25 **Uncontested Fact No. 5:** On April 4, 2003, Howrey attorney Louis Campbell was informed by Dr.  
 26 Thomas that Ricoh had already engaged him as a consulting expert. (Brothers Decl. Ex. 7.) Mr. Campbell  
 27 recognized that "there is most likely a conflict if we would talk to you in detail about the matter. So,  
 28 unfortunately, it appears that we cannot go forward." (Brothers Decl. Ex. 8.)

29 **Uncontested Fact No. 6:** Shortly after initial contact with Mr. Campbell, Dr. Thomas informed Ricoh  
 30 that "he did not want to be a testifying expert in this action, but said he could continue acting as a non-testifying  
 31 expert" pursuant to Rule 26(b)(4)(B). (Brothers Decl. Ex. 1, Monsey Decl. ¶ 23.) Dr. Thomas thus expressly  
 32

---

28 <sup>2</sup> The documents that were provided to Dr. Thomas also contained annotations and highlighting from Ricoh  
 29 and Ricoh's counsel. (Monsey 12/23/03 Decl. ¶ 2.)

1 agreed to continue acting as a Ricoh consultant. (*Id.*)

2       **Uncontested Fact No. 7:** Mr. Campbell did not promptly contact Ricoh in early April to inquire  
 3 whether Ricoh had an objection to Synopsys' consulting with Dr. Thomas. Instead, Mr. Campbell waited for 3  
 4 1/2 months during which he persuaded Dr. Thomas to terminate his consulting agreement with Ricoh, switch  
 5 sides, and formally engaged him to be a consulting expert for Synopsys, and only then did Mr. Campbell  
 6 inform Ricoh. (Brothers Decl. Exs. 11, 14-22.)

7       **Uncontested Fact No. 8:** Respondents failed to serve Ricoh with a copy of the subpoena to Dr.  
 8 Thomas. Although Mr. Kelley now characterizes this as a “screw-up” on his firm’s part (Brothers Decl. Ex.  
 9 12, 7/30/03 Tr. at 13), there is no dispute that the Howrey firm’s “practice is to provide opposing counsel with  
 10 notice of process **after** service is successfully completed.” (Brothers Decl. Ex. 13, Kelley 9/17/03 letter to  
 11 Hoffman, emphasis added.)<sup>3</sup>

12       **Uncontested Fact No. 9:** Respondents also failed to serve Ricoh with a notice of the July 30  
 13 deposition of Dr. Thomas. (Brothers Decl. Ex. 9.) Respondents’ declarations do not explain why the  
 14 deposition notice was not served.

15       **Uncontested Fact No. 10:** As part of his effort to persuade Dr. Thomas to switch sides, Mr. Campbell  
 16 told Dr. Thomas that Ricoh had not named him as a witness. (Campbell Decl. ¶ 9.) Mr. Campbell states that  
 17 the basis of this statement was his review of Ricoh’s Rule 26(a) initial disclosure statement (*id.*), although Rule  
 18 26(a) statements do not require the disclosure of non-testifying expert witnesses. *Crouse v. National*  
 19 *Warehouse Investment Co.*, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9066 at \*5-\*6 (S.D. Ind. 2003)(Monsey 12/23/03 Decl. Ex.  
 20 3). Moreover, at the time the case schedule did not require the disclosure of experts until March 22, 2004.  
 21 (Monsey 12/23/03 Decl. Ex. 1.)

22       **Uncontested Fact No. 11:** Synopsys formally retained Dr. Thomas as a consulting expert on July 21,  
 23 2003. (Brothers Decl. Ex. 21.) The retainer agreement presumes that Dr. Thomas had previously received  
 24 Ricoh confidential information, and committed Dr. Thomas that he “will agree not to give expert testimony  
 25 adverse to Synopsys, Inc.” (*Id.* at PTH000047.)

---

26  
 27       <sup>3</sup> The opposition briefs make no apologies for this “practice” (Opp. Br. at 7 n.3) even thought it violates Rule  
 28 45. *Biocore Medical Tech., Inc., v. Khasrowshahi*, 181 F.R.D. 660, 667 (D. Kan. 1998) (the failure to give  
 opposing counsel notice of a subpoena **prior** to service violates Rule 45).

**1**           **Uncontested Fact No. 12:** Only after Dr. Thomas was formally retained did respondents notify Ricoh  
**2** of this fact as a *fait accompli*:

**3**           This letter is to inform you that we have retained Dr. Donald Thomas as a consultant. We are,  
**4** therefore, taking the deposition of Dr. Thomas, currently scheduled for July 31, 2003, off calendar.  
**5** (Brothers Decl. Ex. 22.) After Ricoh immediately objected (Brothers Decl. Ex. 23), Synopsys refused to  
**6** withdraw, or ask Ricoh to explain why Dr. Thomas should not consult for Synopsys, but instead insisted that  
**7** Ricoh present the issue to the Delaware court within 14 days or waive the issue. (Campbell Decl. Ex. I;  
**8** Brothers Decl. Ex. 25.)

**9**           **Uncontested Fact No. 13:** Counsel for respondents conducted no pre-retention investigation of Dr.  
**10** Thomas to determine whether he had entered into a confidential relationship with Ricoh, and whether he had  
**11** received Ricoh confidential information. (Brothers Decl. Ex. 4, Thomas Dep. Tr. at 62-63.) In their opposition  
**12** papers, respondents finally admit that no such investigation was done, but seek to justify it because to do a “full  
**13** inquiry” into the matter “before disclosing their intention to consult with him” would have been “fraught with  
**14** peril” and “contrary to the guidance of *Wang* and *Shadow Traffic* that early disclosure to opposing counsel is  
**15** best.” (Opp. Br. at 9, ll.19-22.)

**16**           **Uncontested Fact No. 14.** Respondents concede that the only time that Dr. Thomas was asked about  
**17** whether he had a conflict of interest was during a short telephone conversation with Mr. Campbell on July 23,  
**18** after Dr. Thomas was already retained and after Ricoh objected. (Opp. Br. at 4.) Mr. Campbell “wanted to  
**19** understand what of confidentiality [Dr. Thomas] had received.” (Brothers Decl. Ex. 4, Thomas Dep. Tr. at 72.)  
**20** Dr. Thomas replied that he was not sure whether he had or not;<sup>4</sup> but did not, as Mr. Kelley told the Court seven  
**21** days later, “assure[] us that he had not” received Ricoh confidential information. (7/30/03 Tr. at 15.) Mr.  
**22** Campbell also asked Dr. Thomas to describe the types of documents that Ricoh’s counsel had sent to him.  
**23** (Opp. Br. at 4 ll.9-11; Brothers Decl. Ex. 27.) The next day, Dr. Thomas sent an email that inaccurately

---

**24**

**25**

**26** <sup>4</sup> Dr. Thomas could not recall many details from this telephone conversation. (Brothers Decl. Ex. 4, Thomas  
**27** Dep. Tr. at 72-77.) The statement that Dr. Thomas was not certain of whether he received confidential  
information is based on an August 5 letter from Mr. Kelley purporting to summarize the conversation.  
(Brothers Decl. Ex. 29.) Neither Mr. Kelley nor Mr. Campbell have provided a declaration of their recollection  
of the conversation.

1 identified those documents. (*Id.*)<sup>5</sup>

2 **Uncontested Fact No. 15:** Before Dr. Thomas sent his July 24 email responding to Mr. Campbell's  
3 inquiry, the Howrey firm asserted that it had conducted an investigation prior to ever retaining Dr. Thomas:

4 **Before we considered retaining Dr. Thomas as a consultant, we made an investigation to  
determine that this would not create a conflict of interest for Dr. Thomas.** We understand  
5 that some time in the past your firm retained Dr. Thomas retained Dr. Thomas to provide  
6 technical information about historical design synthesis systems. There is nothing confidential or  
7 otherwise protectible about technical characterizations of the prior art or, if such opinions were  
8 offered, about Dr. Thomas' conclusions about the validity of the patent in suit. Dr. Thomas was  
9 not given any confidential information and was not consulted on questions of litigation strategy.  
10 We understand that Dr. Thomas' consulting work ended at some point prior to the initiation of  
11 the present suit.

12 (Campbell Decl. Ex. I, Kelley 7/23/03 letter to Hoffman, emphasis added.) There is now no dispute that nearly  
13 every sentence of this paragraph is factually incorrect. Howrey made no pre-retention investigation to  
14 determine whether there was a conflict of interest, as both Dr. Thomas testified (Brothers Decl. Ex. 8, Thomas  
15 Dep. Tr. at 62-63), and respondents now admit. (Opp Br. at 9.) Dr. Thomas was not consulted by Ricoh to  
16 "provide technical information about historical design synthesis systems," but to analyze the '432 patent and  
17 help determine issues relating to validity, infringement and litigation strategy. (Monsey Dec. ¶¶ 5-15.) Dr.  
18 Thomas received Ricoh confidential information. (*Id.*; Ex. 4, Thomas Dep. Tr. at 76-77.) And Dr. Thomas did  
19 not terminate his relationship with Ricoh "prior to the initiation of the present suit," but was a Ricoh consultant  
20 until July 2003, when he terminated his agreement at Mr. Campbell's behest. (*Id.* at 54.)

21 **Uncontested Fact No. 16:** At the emergency hearing on July 30, Mr. Kelley repeated his July 23  
22 assertion to Ricoh's counsel when he told Judge Sleet that Dr. Thomas "had indicated he had not received any  
23 such information that would create a conflict. If that's true, we wanted to get into that consulting relationship."  
24 (Brothers Dec. Ex. 12, 7/30/03 Tr. at 15.)

25 **Uncontested Fact No. 17:** The July 31 Order required the production of a privilege log: "Defendants  
26 shall provide Plaintiff with a detailed privilege log." (Brothers Decl. Ex. 30, 7/31/03 Order.)

---

27 <sup>5</sup> Dr. Thomas identified categories of documents, and respondents concluded that all were publicly available.  
28 This response is both inaccurate and misses the point. Not all documents sent to Dr. Thomas were publicly  
available. (Monsey 12/23/03 Decl. ¶ 3.) In addition, some of the documents sent to Dr. Thomas contained  
marginalia and notes from both Ricoh and its attorneys. (*Id.* ¶ 2.) In any event, the measure of what was  
communicated to Dr. Thomas is more than just the documents, but also the nature and content of his  
consultations with Ricoh's counsel.

**1**      **Uncontested Fact No. 18:** During the August 28 hearing, Judge Sleet rejected respondents' arguments  
**2** that their privileged documents should not be produced under the July 31 order. Although they now argue that  
**3** there was never an order to produce a privilege log, respondents cannot dispute the following August 28  
**4** hearing exchange:

**5**      Mr. Hoffman [Ricoh attorney]: *Right now, all we are looking for at this time is a list of those*  
**6** *communication on a privilege log.* [Interruption omitted] Most people quite often provide a list of  
**7** privileged documents, anyway. Normally, once the litigation starts, you don't continue. But this is a  
**8** special situation. And we are asking the Court – the way we believe the [July 31] order read, we ask  
**9** the Court to require the Howrey & Simon firm and defendants to provide a list of the privileged  
**10** documents. *We also ask that the limited number of documents – I can't imagine there is many in*  
*this category – to be provided to the Court, so that when the Court has the issues laid before it, we*  
*can ask for what relief we think is appropriate and the Court can fashion relief that is believes is*  
*appropriate.*

**11**     The Court: Ms. Corbin [respondents' attorney], what is the extent of the potential production at issue  
**12** here?

**13**     Ms. Corbin: I wouldn't be able to address that. I wouldn't have personal knowledge at this point.

**14**     Mr. Kelley: I can give you an estimate. I think there is a handful of e-mails.

**15**     *The Court: Let's produce them for the Court.*

**16**     (Brothers Decl. Ex. 31, 8/28/03 Tr. at 22-23, emphasis added.) The fact that this order included a privilege log  
**17** was made clear later in the hearing:

**18**     Mr. Brothers [Ricoh attorney]: . . . In any event, Your Honor has ordered the Howrey firm to product  
**19** those handful of internal documents. I would ask that, because the order of July 31st provides that by  
**20** August 31st, we may file a two-page letter, I would just ask that that be postponed until 10 days *after*  
*the submission of the privilege log and internal documents.*

**21**     The Court: *That is an acceptable process. We will follow that recommendation.*

**22**     (Brothers Decl. Ex. 31, 8/28/03 Tr. at 26-27, emphasis added.)

**23**     **Uncontested Fact No. 19:** At the August 28 hearing, Judge Sleet agreed that Mr. Kelley may have  
**24** attempted a “fraud on the court.” Immediately after the Court agreed that respondents should produce the  
**25** internal Howrey documents to the Court and a privilege log to Ricoh’s counsel, respondents’ counsel protested  
**26** that Ricoh was “trying to break the privilege,” and the only basis for that was the crime/fraud exception. The  
**27** colloquy continued:

**28**     The Court: I understand what it is. I know the crime/fraud exception, counsel. Mr. Brothers, do you  
**29** have a view on the crime fraud exception? Do you want to say anything about that?

**30**     Mr. Hoffman: Your Honor, if I can briefly respond. First of all, to return to one of the points in history  
**31** because it lays the foundation for this. *There was a representation to the Court that Dr. Thomas had*  
*told the Howrey people that he received no confidential information.*

1           The Court: *I remember that.*

2           Mr. Hoffman: In fact, the Court made a comment about relying on Dr. Thomas' legal opinion when  
 3           that was indicated. Dr. Thomas, during his deposition, though, testified that he did receive confidential  
 4           information from Ricoh, obviously inconsistent with the representations. There is a number of  
 5           representations that have been made to the Court that have been inconsistent – I am sorry,  
 6           representations to the Court that are inconsistent with the documents we have obtained to date and also  
 7           Dr. Thomas' testimony. *Your Honor, I think that the whole issue of making certain representations*  
*to the Court that they know are inconsistent and those documents that we are asking be turned over*  
*to the Court may further our belief, support our belief, does create an issue of potential fraud on the*  
*Court.*

8           The Court. *I think it does.* The Court is going to order the July 30 transcript for inspection at the same  
 9           time that it reviews the documents that I have just ordered to be produced.

10          (Brothers Decl. Ex. 31, 8/28/03 Tr. at 28-29, emphasis added.) When respondents finally submitted the  
 11         documents two months later on October 30, they refused to produce a privilege log to Ricoh's counsel.

## 12         II.        RESPONDENTS HAVE MISSTATED THE APPLICABLE LAW

### 13         A.        The Controlling Standard of Proof for Sanctions Motions

14          Courts can sanction or discipline parties under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for discovery  
 15         abuses, under 28 U.S.C §1927 or, within its inherent powers, for violations that fall outside the Federal Rules or  
 16         § 1927. The Supreme Court has made clear that a court may exercise its inherent powers to sanction where a  
 17         party "acted in bad faith, vexatiously, wantonly, or for oppressive reasons" or in cases where a party "shows  
 18         bad faith by delaying or disrupting the litigation or by hampering enforcement of a court order." *Chambers v.*  
*Nasco*, 501 U.S. 32, 45-46 (1991). The Ninth Circuit held that it was within the court's inherent power to  
 19         exclude the testimony of a side switching expert. *Campbell Industries v. M/V Gemini*, 619 F.2d 24 at 27 (9th  
 20         Cir. 1980).

21          Respondents claim that "clear and convincing evidence" is needed. The Ninth Circuit, however, has  
 22         not held that clear and convincing proof for sanctions is required under a Court's inherent powers. Instead, the  
 23         Ninth Circuit has stated that "[b]efore awarding sanctions under its inherent powers, however, the court must  
 24         make an explicit finding that counsel's conduct 'constituted or was tantamount to bad faith.'" *Primus v.*  
*Batarse*, 115 F.3d 644, 648 (9th Cir. 1997), quoting *Roadway Express, Inc. v. Piper*, 447 U.S. 752, 762  
 25         (1980).<sup>6</sup> Regardless of the standard – preponderance, clear and convincing, or "explicit finding" – Ricoh's

---

26  
 27  
 28         <sup>6</sup> The Ninth Circuit has yet to determine under what standard of proof the district court must make its bad faith  
 determination, clear and convincing or a preponderance of the evidence. *F.J. Hanshaw Enterprises v. Emerald*

1 motion should be granted.

2 **B. This Court Has The Power and Right to Protect Ricoh's Confidential Information**

3 Ricoh quoted and cited a number of cases in its opening brief (at pp. 18-23) supporting the proposition  
 4 that an expert who obtains one side's attorney work product cannot then switch sides and consult for the other  
 5 side in the same case. Respondents repeatedly suggest, however, that the side-switching cases require the  
 6 relevant knowledge to be limited to attorney-client information. See Opp. Br. 11-12. Implicitly, respondents  
 7 suggest that the court is powerless to protect attorney work product. The power of courts is not so narrow,  
 8 however. The protection of work product led to the disqualification of Latham & Watkins in *Shadow Traffic v.*  
 9 *Superior Court*, 24 Cal.App 4<sup>th</sup> 1067 (1994). This Court has recognized the importance of protecting both  
 10 attorney-client and work product protected material that could be disclosed in the case of a side switching  
 11 expert. "The concerns raised by the disclosure of litigation-related, privileged information are naturally great,  
 12 since the integrity of the adversary system could easily be undermined." *Space Systems/Loral v. Martin*  
 13 *Marietta Corp.*, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22305 at \*14 (N.D. Cal. 1995) (Brothers Decl. Ex. 37). This  
 14 protection of privileged information expressly includes attorney work product, such as an attorney's selection  
 15 and grouping of photographs and documents given to an expert, because the selection of those documents  
 16 represented the mental impressions of the attorney and are therefore protected work product. *Cordy v. Sherwin*  
 17 *Williams*, 156 F.R.D. 575, 581 (D.N.J. 1994).

18 **C. Mr. Campbell's Ongoing Contacts With Dr. Thomas Were Improper**

19 Respondents concede that Mr. Campbell had multiple case-related communications with Dr. Thomas  
 20 with the knowledge that he was a Ricoh expert. The appropriate course of conduct should have been to  
 21 terminate all communications as of April 4, when Mr. Campbell was informed that Dr. Thomas was an adverse  
 22 expert. *See, e.g., Campbell Ind. v. M/V Gemini*, 619 F.2d 24, 27 (9th Cir. 1980) (sanctioning counsel for ex  
 23 parte communications with opposing party's expert); *Erickson v. Newmar Corp.*, 87 F.3d 298, 301-02 (9th Cir.  
 24 1996) (holding that ex parte communications with the opposing side's expert violated Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(4)  
 25 and ethical rules). "Since existing rules of civil procedure carefully provide for limited and controlled  
 26

---

27 *River Development, Inc.*, 244 F.3d 1128, 1143 n.11 (9th Cir. 2000) (affirming \$200,000 award of fees and  
 28 noting unresolved issue regarding burden of proof); *In Re Silberkraus*, 253 B.R. 890, 913-14 (Bankr. C.D. Cal.  
 2000) (explicit finding of bad faith was sufficient).

1 discovery of an opposing party's expert witnesses, all other forms of contact are impliedly prohibited.” 2  
 2 Geoffrey C. Hazard & W. William Hodes, *The Law of Lawyering* § 3.4:402 (2d ed. Supp. 1994).

3 But Mr. Campbell did not terminate his communications with Ricoh’s expert. Between April 8 and  
 4 early May, he exchanged a half-dozen emails with Dr. Campbell. All related to this case. Although  
 5 respondents contend that Mr. Campbell did nothing wrong, his actions were contrary to the admonitions in  
 6 *Campbell and Erickson* and the *The Law of Lawyering* hornbook. Respondents attempt to sidestep the issue by  
 7 claiming that Mr. Campbell’s contacts with respect to Dr. Kowalski’s phone number was not an opinion  
 8 developed by Dr. Thomas for Ricoh, and therefore permissible. The only case cited for this proposition is *Atari*  
 9 *Corp v. Sega of America*, 161 F.R.D. 417, 421-22 (N.D. Cal. 1994), which concerns waiver of privilege by  
 10 voluntary disclosure during a settlement negotiation. *Id.* The witness in *Atari* was a former employee of the  
 11 opposing side, the inventor and an “instrumental actor” in relation to the disputed patent, not a side-switching,  
 12 non-actor expert as in the present litigation. *Id.* Thus, *Atari* is inapposite.

13 More importantly, however, is Mr. Campbell’s continued communications with Dr. Thomas *after* the  
 14 witness was served with Howrey’s undisclosed subpoena. Those communications were directly relevant to Dr.  
 15 Thomas’ consulting with Ricoh, but Mr. Campbell never said to Dr. Thomas: “I cannot talk with you as long  
 16 as you are a consultant for Ricoh.” Instead, Mr. Campbell gave incomplete and misleading information that led  
 17 Dr. Thomas to believe that Ricoh had dropped him as an expert. See, e.g., *Durflinger v. Artiles*, 727 F.2d 888  
 18 at 891 (10th Cir. 1984) (defendant’s subversive communications with plaintiff’s nontestifying expert violated  
 19 Rule 26; affirming exclusion of any testimony).

### 20 III. THE DISPUTED FACTS FURTHER SUPPORT RICOH’S MOTION

#### 21 A. Respondents’ Conduct Was Inconsistent With *Shadow Traffic* and *Wang*

22 Respondents attempt to couch their conduct in terms of what they speculate the courts in *Shadow*  
*Traffic v. Superior Court*, 24 Cal.App. 4th 1067 (1994), and *Wang Laboratories v. Toshiba Corp.*, 762 F.Supp.  
 23 1246 (E.D. Va. 1991), would propose as “proper conduct.” Respondents misquote *Shadow Traffic* to imply that  
 24 “proper conduct” ended when defense counsel contacted Ricoh regarding Dr. Thomas. (Opp. Br. at 8.)  
 25 However, they fail to point out that the next step is to obtain consent or, when an objection was raised, present  
 26 it to the court. *Shadow Traffic*, at 702-03, 705 & n10. *Wang* also encourages that, in addition to prompt  
 27 disclosure, the matter should be “discussed thoroughly in an effort to resolve the dispute before it is raised in

court.” *Wang*, at 1250. During their belated contact with Ricoh regarding Dr. Thomas, respondents neither discussed the issue with Ricoh in an attempt to gain consent, nor did they actually gain consent, nor did they present their objection to the Court. Instead, they simply told Ricoh of the fact of their retention of Dr. Thomas and told Ricoh if it objected, then Ricoh needed to get a court order to stop them. There is a world of difference between respondents’ conduct and the proper course, as outlined by *Shadow Traffic* and *Wang*.<sup>7</sup>

Had respondents adhered to the outline of those cases, they would not have continued to communicate with Dr. Thomas after April 4, but would have instead attempted to obtain Ricoh’s consent, “discussed thoroughly” the matter with Ricoh’s counsel, and then raise it with the Court, *before* ever attempting to retain Dr. Thomas. This way, respondents would have learned that, under *Shadow Traffic* and *Wang*, there was no reasonable basis to expect that Dr. Thomas could consult for respondents.<sup>8</sup>

#### **B. Dr. Thomas Has Been Tainted By Respondents’ Conduct**

Dr. Thomas was a non-testifying expert retained by Ricoh to help provide technical assistance with respect to the construction of the ‘432 patent, analyze the prior art, form opinions with respect to the validity of the patent-in-suit, and determine whether respondents were infringing upon the patent. In hours of phone conversations with Ricoh’s counsel, Dr. Thomas was advised of Ricoh’s litigation strategy and core work product. (Monsey Decl. ¶¶ 5-15.) There is no way that Dr. Thomas can separate his pre-Ricoh consulting knowledge from his post-Ricoh consulting knowledge. Any fact deposition of Dr. Thomas, no matter how closely circumscribed, will inevitably lead to the disclosure of Ricoh’s confidential information.<sup>9</sup>

Ricoh’s opening brief cited and discussed (at pp. 18-23) a number of cases in which side-switching experts were precluded from providing any testimony. Respondents argue that Dr. Thomas may have some limited factual knowledge regarding a purported prior art system. The only evidence they cite in support is an

---

<sup>7</sup> In *Shadow Traffic*, the lower court said all that was needed to avoid the problem was “a simple phone call to [opposing counsel] saying ‘We are interested in hiring the expert you talked to that you did not hire. Is there going to be any problem?’” 24 Cal.App. 4<sup>th</sup> at 698. Respondents never made that “simple phone call.”

<sup>8</sup> The fact that respondents dropped Dr. Thomas as an expert after receiving the Monsey declaration reinforces the fact that, had respondents made the proper inquiry, no judicial action would have been required.

<sup>9</sup> Ironically, respondents have demonstrated that Dr. Thomas is prone to make “gratuitous” statements in which he inadvertently reveals Ricoh confidential information. See Opp. Br. at 12, ll.6-18 (citing Dr. Thomas’ “gratuitous” testimony).

1 identification of two articles in which Dr. Thomas is listed, not as the lead author, but as a co-author. (D.I. 68,  
 2 at 2.) In fact, Synopsys has identified more than 30 persons as potential fact witnesses in the same field as Dr.  
 3 Thomas. (Monsey 12/23/03 Decl. Ex. 2, Synopsys Rule 26(a) disclosure.) Dr. Thomas is merely one of those  
 4 30 witnesses. Respondents already have retained Dr. Kowalski, Dr. Thomas' co-author of one of the cited  
 5 articles, as expert on the same subject (Brothers Decl. Ex. 33), so excluding Dr. Thomas would not preclude  
 6 respondents from any discovery. Thus, there is no hardship on respondents by excluding testimony from Dr.  
 7 Thomas, because any factual evidence he could provide would be cumulative.<sup>10</sup>

8 If respondents were to call Dr. Thomas as a fact witness, it would create a double prejudice to Ricoh.  
 9 “[P]ermitting one party to call an expert previously retained or consulted by the other side entails a risk of very  
 10 substantial prejudice stemming from the fact of the prior retention, quite apart from the substance of the  
 11 testimony.” *Rubel v. Eli Lilly*, 160 F.R.D. 458, 460 (S.D.N.Y. 1995). In short, there is nothing unique to Dr.  
 12 Thomas that cannot be obtained from Dr. Kowalski or the other 28 experts in design automation that Synopsys  
 13 has listed as fact witnesses.

#### 14 C. Respondents Have Wrongfully Refused to Produce a Privilege Log

15 There is no question that respondents have failed to produce a privilege log to Ricoh’s counsel. The  
 16 only issue is whether the Delaware court required a privilege log to be served. Ricoh submits that the Court’s  
 17 order of July 31 explicitly required production of a privilege log, and this order was expressly reaffirmed by the  
 18 Court on August 28, as set forth above at “undisputed fact no. 18.”

#### 19 D. Respondents Misled the Court

20 As set forth above in “uncontested fact No. 15,” on July 23, attorney Kelley represented that, “[b]efore  
 21 we considered retaining Dr. Thomas as a consultant, we made an investigation to determine that his would not  
 22 create a conflict of interest for Dr. Thomas.” (Campbell Decl. Ex. I, Kelley 7/23/03 letter to Hoffman.)  
 23 Respondents now concede this was false. See *supra* p. 7. Seven days later, however, Mr. Kelley repeated this  
 24 false statement to the Court, saying that Dr. Thomas “had indicated he had not received any such information  
 25 that would create a conflict. If that’s true, we wanted to get into that consulting relationship.” Mr. Kelley’s

---

26  
 27 10 Respondents cite no cases in which a side switching expert who was not a former employee with direct  
 28 factual knowledge of key events was permitted to provide limited fact testimony. Dr. Thomas does not meet  
 these strict limitations and respondents should not be rewarded by their misconduct.

1 complete colloquy with the Court makes clear that he intended to communicate that respondents made an  
 2 investigation first, and only thereafter decided to retain Dr. Thomas:

3 The Court: ...I'm just trying to understand that, where we are in terms of the prima facie showing.  
 4 You indicate that when you communicated with Dr. Thomas, you learned at that time that plaintiff's  
 5 counsel had worked with him a year prior on another case or this case?

6 Mr. Kelley: Well, we didn't get into that. I presumed it was in preparation for this matter, had  
 7 something to do with this patent.

8 The Court: And that on its face in your view would not present at least the potential for the appearance  
 9 of a conflict?

10 Mr. Kelley: That's why we did not pursue it at that time. I understand the question of the Court.

11 The Court" Okay.

12 Mr. Kelley: Let me give you a little bit more history then.

13 The Court: Okay.

14 Mr. Kelley: When we sent the subpoena to Don Thomas, he called us back. We didn't hear from his  
 15 counsel. He didn't give it to plaintiff and say, You folks deal with it, I'm working for you. ***He called***  
***us back and indicated to us he wasn't working with them and indicated that he was interested in***  
***working with us.***

16 ***And so we, not wanting to tread into the subject matter, we were put in this situation. We're very***  
***interested in working with Dr. Thomas given that he's a leading luminary in the field, but also we're***  
***concerned about this prior work he had done.***

17 ***So what we asked: Have you received anything confidential from Ricoh, did you talk to them about***  
***case strategy? We understand those are the two kinds of things that create a conflict of interest.***  
***And he assured us he had not.***

18 Whether he did, obviously counsel for plaintiff is indicating that he did receive that information.  
 19 Sitting here, I have no idea who's correct on that dispute. ***But having asked Dr. Thomas, well, if what***  
***he said is true, we should be able to use his services under the relevant case law and so what we did***  
***is say we're interested in retaining you, but we're going to notify the other side.*** We're not going to  
 20 do anything about the fact we want to work with you. We're not going to consult with you. We're not  
 21 going ask [sic] to ask for your opinions yet. We are going to give them notice we want to enter into this  
 22 relationship, which is how we ended up where we are today.

23 ***Yes, I was aware that we were certainly aware there was a possibility that he might have a conflict of***  
***interest, but he had indicated he had not received any such information that would create a conflict.***  
***If that's true, we wanted to get into that consulting relationship.***

24 The Court: Well, that's his legal opinion?

25 Mr. Kelley: It's not his legal opinion. We have to walk a little carefully. I didn't say please tell us  
 26 what you received so we can make an independent evaluation, but what we did say is, if you get  
 27 anything that's confidential, any kind of confidential information, did you folks talk about case  
 28 strategy?

The Court: Well, that may be in the eye of beholder, perhaps, Mr. Kelley. Yes, no, maybe?

Mr. Kelley: Certainly . . .

(Brothers Decl. Ex. 12, 7/30/03 Tr. at 13-16.) This colloquy makes clear what respondents intended to

1 communicate: "We first did an investigation, and only after we determined that there was no conflict did we  
 2 retain Dr. Thomas." At the August 28 hearing, Judge Sleet agreed that this was his understanding of  
 3 respondents' argument. (Brothers Decl. Ex. 31, 8/28/03 Tr. at 29.) There is now no dispute that no such pre-  
 4 retention investigation ever took place. It was false when it was said, and it remains false today.

5 Respondents now argue that they did not really mean to say that they did a pre-retention investigation.  
 6 Their argument echoes another tortured (and unsuccessful) temporal scramble: "It depends on what the  
 7 meaning of 'is' is." Given both the prior inaccurate representations to counsel and the context of Mr. Kelley's  
 8 argument, there is explicit and clear evidence that Mr. Kelley misled the Court on July 30.<sup>11</sup>

#### 9 IV. CONCLUSION: SANCTIONS ARE APPROPRIATE

10 To permit Dr. Thomas to testify would be to reward respondents for their improper conduct in  
 11 depriving Ricoh of its consulting expert, while subjecting it to the very real risk that Dr. Thomas will divulge  
 12 confidential Ricoh information. To fail to compensate Ricoh for its expenses would tacitly reward  
 13 respondents' actions in multiplying this litigation.<sup>12</sup> To fail to hold respondents' counsel accountable would  
 14 ignore the lessons of *Shadow Traffic* and *Cordy*. Ricoh's motion should be granted.

15 Dated: December 23, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

16 Ricoh Company, Ltd.

17 By: Kenneth Brothers

18 Jeffrey B. Demain, State Bar No. 126715  
 19 Jonathan Weissglass, State Bar No. 185008  
 20 Altshuler, Berzon, Nussbaum, Rubin & Demain  
 21 177 Post Street, Suite 300  
 22 San Francisco, California 94108  
 Phone: (415) 421-7151  
 Fax: (415) 362-8064

Gary M. Hoffman  
 Kenneth W. Brothers  
 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
 OSHINSKY LLP  
 2101 L Street NW  
 Washington, D.C. 20037-1526  
 Telephone: (202) 785-9700  
 Facsimile: (202) 887-0689

23 Attorneys for Ricoh Company, Ltd.

25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525  
 526  
 527  
 528  
 529  
 530  
 531  
 532  
 533  
 534  
 535  
 536  
 537  
 538  
 539  
 540  
 541  
 542  
 543  
 544  
 545  
 546  
 547  
 548  
 549  
 550  
 551  
 552  
 553  
 554  
 555  
 556  
 557  
 558  
 559  
 560  
 561  
 562  
 563  
 564  
 565  
 566  
 567  
 568  
 569  
 570  
 571  
 572  
 573  
 574  
 575  
 576  
 577  
 578  
 579  
 580  
 581  
 582  
 583  
 584  
 585  
 586  
 587  
 588  
 589  
 590  
 591  
 592  
 593  
 594  
 595  
 596  
 597  
 598  
 599  
 600  
 601  
 602  
 603  
 604  
 605  
 606  
 607  
 608  
 609  
 610  
 611  
 612  
 613  
 614  
 615  
 616  
 617  
 618  
 619  
 620  
 621  
 622  
 623  
 624  
 625  
 626  
 627  
 628  
 629  
 630  
 631  
 632  
 633  
 634  
 635  
 636  
 637  
 638  
 639  
 640  
 641  
 642  
 643  
 644  
 645  
 646  
 647  
 648  
 649  
 650  
 651  
 652  
 653  
 654  
 655  
 656  
 657  
 658  
 659  
 660  
 661  
 662  
 663  
 664  
 665  
 666  
 667  
 668  
 669  
 670  
 671  
 672  
 673  
 674  
 675  
 676  
 677  
 678  
 679  
 680  
 681  
 682  
 683  
 684  
 685  
 686  
 687  
 688  
 689  
 690  
 691  
 692  
 693  
 694  
 695  
 696  
 697  
 698  
 699  
 700  
 701  
 702  
 703  
 704  
 705  
 706  
 707  
 708  
 709  
 710  
 711  
 712  
 713  
 714  
 715  
 716  
 717  
 718  
 719  
 720  
 721  
 722  
 723  
 724  
 725  
 726  
 727  
 728  
 729  
 730  
 731  
 732  
 733  
 734  
 735  
 736  
 737  
 738  
 739  
 740  
 741  
 742  
 743  
 744  
 745  
 746  
 747  
 748  
 749  
 750  
 751  
 752  
 753  
 754  
 755  
 756  
 757  
 758  
 759  
 760  
 761  
 762  
 763  
 764  
 765  
 766  
 767  
 768  
 769  
 770  
 771  
 772  
 773  
 774  
 775  
 776  
 777  
 778  
 779  
 780  
 781  
 782  
 783  
 784  
 785  
 786  
 787  
 788  
 789  
 790  
 791  
 792  
 793  
 794  
 795  
 796  
 797  
 798  
 799  
 800  
 801  
 802  
 803  
 804  
 805  
 806  
 807  
 808  
 809  
 8010  
 8011  
 8012  
 8013  
 8014  
 8015  
 8016  
 8017  
 8018  
 8019  
 8020  
 8021  
 8022  
 8023  
 8024  
 8025  
 8026  
 8027  
 8028  
 8029  
 8030  
 8031  
 8032  
 8033  
 8034  
 8035  
 8036  
 8037  
 8038  
 8039  
 8040  
 8041  
 8042  
 8043  
 8044  
 8045  
 8046  
 8047  
 8048  
 8049  
 8050  
 8051  
 8052  
 8053  
 8054  
 8055  
 8056  
 8057  
 8058  
 8059  
 8060  
 8061  
 8062  
 8063  
 8064  
 8065  
 8066  
 8067  
 8068  
 8069  
 8070  
 8071  
 8072  
 8073  
 8074  
 8075  
 8076  
 8077  
 8078  
 8079  
 8080  
 8081  
 8082  
 8083  
 8084  
 8085  
 8086  
 8087  
 8088  
 8089  
 8090  
 8091  
 8092  
 8093  
 8094  
 8095  
 8096  
 8097  
 8098  
 8099  
 80100  
 80101  
 80102  
 80103  
 80104  
 80105  
 80106  
 80107  
 80108  
 80109  
 80110  
 80111  
 80112  
 80113  
 80114  
 80115  
 80116  
 80117  
 80118  
 80119  
 80120  
 80121  
 80122  
 80123  
 80124  
 80125  
 80126  
 80127  
 80128  
 80129  
 80130  
 80131  
 80132  
 80133  
 80134  
 80135  
 80136  
 80137  
 80138  
 80139  
 80140  
 80141  
 80142  
 80143  
 80144  
 80145  
 80146  
 80147  
 80148  
 80149  
 80150  
 80151  
 80152  
 80153  
 80154  
 80155  
 80156  
 80157  
 80158  
 80159  
 80160  
 80161  
 80162  
 80163  
 80164  
 80165  
 80166  
 80167  
 80168  
 80169  
 80170  
 80171  
 80172  
 80173  
 80174  
 80175  
 80176  
 80177  
 80178  
 80179  
 80180  
 80181  
 80182  
 80183  
 80184  
 80185  
 80186  
 80187  
 80188  
 80189  
 80190  
 80191  
 80192  
 80193  
 80194  
 80195  
 80196  
 80197  
 80198  
 80199  
 80200  
 80201  
 80202  
 80203  
 80204  
 80205  
 80206  
 80207  
 80208  
 80209  
 80210  
 80211  
 80212  
 80213  
 80214  
 80215  
 80216  
 80217  
 80218  
 80219  
 80220  
 80221  
 80222  
 80223  
 80224  
 80225  
 80226  
 80227  
 80228  
 80229  
 80230  
 80231  
 80232  
 80233  
 80234  
 80235  
 80236  
 80237  
 80238  
 80239  
 80240  
 80241  
 80242  
 80243  
 80244  
 80245  
 80246  
 80247  
 80248  
 80249  
 80250  
 80251  
 80252  
 80253  
 80254  
 80255  
 80256  
 80257  
 80258  
 80259  
 80260  
 80261  
 80262  
 80263  
 80264  
 80265  
 80266  
 80267  
 80268  
 80269  
 80270  
 80271  
 80272  
 80273  
 80274  
 80275  
 80276  
 80277  
 80278  
 80279  
 80280  
 80281  
 80282  
 80283  
 80284  
 80285  
 80286  
 80287  
 80288  
 80289  
 80290  
 80291  
 80292  
 80293  
 80294  
 80295  
 80296  
 80297  
 80298  
 80299  
 80300  
 80301  
 80302  
 80303  
 80304  
 80305  
 80306  
 80307  
 80308  
 80309  
 80310  
 80311  
 80312  
 80313  
 80314  
 80315  
 80316  
 80317  
 80318  
 80319  
 80320  
 80321  
 80322  
 80323  
 80324  
 80325  
 80326  
 80327  
 80328  
 80329  
 80330  
 80331  
 80332  
 80333  
 80334  
 80335  
 80336  
 80337  
 80338  
 80339  
 80340  
 80341  
 80342  
 80343  
 80344  
 80345  
 80346  
 80347  
 80348  
 80349  
 80350  
 80351  
 80352  
 80353  
 80354  
 80355  
 80356  
 80357  
 80358  
 80359  
 80360  
 80361  
 80362  
 80363  
 80364  
 80365  
 80366  
 80367  
 80368  
 80369  
 80370  
 80371  
 80372  
 80373  
 80374  
 80375  
 80376  
 80377  
 80378  
 80379  
 80380  
 80381  
 80382  
 80383  
 80384  
 80385  
 80386  
 80387  
 80388  
 80389  
 80390  
 80391  
 80392  
 80393  
 80394  
 80395  
 80396  
 80397  
 80398  
 80399  
 80400  
 80401  
 80402  
 80403  
 80404  
 80405  
 80406  
 80407  
 80408  
 80409  
 80410  
 80411  
 80412  
 80413  
 80414  
 80415  
 80416  
 80417  
 80418  
 80419  
 80420  
 80421  
 80422  
 80423  
 80424  
 80425  
 80426  
 80427  
 80428  
 80429  
 80430  
 80431  
 80432  
 80433  
 80434  
 80435  
 80436  
 80437  
 80438  
 80439  
 80440  
 80441  
 80442  
 80443  
 80444  
 80445  
 80446  
 80447  
 80448  
 80449  
 80450  
 80451  
 80452  
 80453  
 80454  
 80455  
 80456  
 80457  
 80458  
 80459  
 80460  
 80461  
 80462  
 80463  
 80464  
 80465  
 80466  
 80467  
 80468  
 80469  
 80470  
 80471  
 80472  
 80473  
 80474  
 80475  
 80476  
 80477  
 80478  
 80479  
 80480  
 80481  
 80482  
 80483  
 80484  
 80485  
 80486  
 80487  
 80488  
 80489  
 80490  
 80491  
 80492  
 80493  
 80494  
 80495  
 80496  
 80497  
 80498  
 80499  
 80500  
 80501  
 80502  
 80503  
 80504  
 80505  
 80506  
 80507  
 80508  
 80509  
 80510  
 80511  
 80512  
 80513  
 80514  
 80515  
 80516  
 80517  
 80518  
 80519  
 80520  
 80521  
 80522  
 80523  
 80524  
 80525  
 80526  
 80527  
 80528  
 80529  
 80530  
 80531  
 80532  
 80533  
 80534  
 80535  
 80536  
 80537  
 80538  
 80539  
 80540  
 80541  
 80542  
 80543  
 80544  
 80545  
 80546  
 80547  
 80548  
 80549  
 80550  
 80551  
 80552  
 80553  
 80554  
 80555  
 80556